```
Page 1
                    BEFORE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
 1
               ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL
 2
 3
     In the matter of:
     Application No. 2002-01
     BP WEST COAST PRODUCTS, LLC,
                                            Public Comment Meeting
                                        )
 5
                                         )
                                            on the Draft EIS
     BP CHERRY POINT
                                              Pages 1 - 25
     COGENERATION PROJECT
 7
                A Public Meeting in the above matter was held in
     the presence of a court reporter on October 1, 2003, at 7:00
 8
     p.m., at 975 H Street, in Blaine, Washington, before Energy
 9
     Facility Site Evaluation Council Members.
10
11
12
                     MR. FIKSDAL: First, we have to come up are
13
       Mark Lawrence, Rob Pochert, and then Dan Newell.
                      COMMENTS BY MARK LAWRENCE
14
                     Mark Lawrence, 813 Fieldston, Bellingham,
15
16
       Washington 98225. I'm in support of this cogen plant with
17
            At a time of slow economic recovery Whatcom County
18
       has a unique opportunity to bring a power source for
                                                                        1(1)
19
       future development and also a power source for development
       that's here in Whatcom County right now.
20
21
                     Whatcom County is a unique location.
22
       have a port that is available for deep water. We also
23
       have lots of energy of the community to bring this to it.
24
       I'm a very small business owner in Whatcom County. I work
       all over the State of Washington and Idaho. Whatcom
25
```

	Page 2
1	County needs a source of income. Whatcom County can I
2	don't think continue to go without a self-source of income
3	and having some stable source of energy. With Alcoa
4	having their issues and some other issues in Whatcom
5	County, we need to have a stable environment for business
6	to continue to support our tax base. Therefore, I support
7	Whatcom County's approval and the state's approval for
8.	this cogeneration plant. Thank you.
9	MR. FIKSDAL: Thank you.
10	Mr. Pochert. Please excuse me for ruining
11	your name. My last name is Fiksdal, and nobody can say
12	that, so I think I have some leeway.
13	COMMENT BY ROB POCHERT
14	Actually you did quite well. I'm Rob
15	Pochert. I'm the president of the Bellingham Whatcom
16	County Economic Development Council. We're located at 105
17	East Holly Street in Bellingham.
18	While the Economic Development Council's
19	primary interest is creating new jobs in Whatcom County,
20°	we also have an interest in the impacts that some of these
21	job creations of other industrial-type activities have on
22	the quality of life here in Whatcom County. As we became
23	familiar with BP's project, obviously some of the
24	questions that I asked and our staff asked, "Just what are
25	some of these impacts?" And I think the reduction in
1	

2(1)

Page 3 pollutants, the mitigation of CO2, Oregon's standards, and 2 I'm from Oregon, so I know what it's like living under those standards, and utilizing the state of technology that is available to reduce emissions have all been very favorable. The potential reuse and recycling of water 5 from another industrial facility I think has got strong 6 7 merits, and obviously let's not overlook the fact that we have an electrical generator here with inner community 8 9 that can provide some stability in a time of what appears to be uncertain, long-term electrical supplies, 10 particularly in light of projected short falls and growing 11 12 needs for electricity. We also recognize obviously the economic 13 14 benefits, both in taxes that will be paid to the state, as well as the County. The full time jobs that are going to 15 be located there, as well as the six to seven hundred 16 17 construction jobs. Looking at a very conservative three 18 to one multiplier these are going to have some very significant economic and financial impacts for Whatcom 19 20 County. The EDC and Western Washington's Center for Economic and Business Research is going to be looking more 21 22 in-depth at just exactly what are the economic impacts 2(2) 23. that Whatcom County can expect to receive in the future, and we plan to submit that written document before your 24 25 November deadline. Thank you.

FLYGARE & ASSOCIATES, INC. 1-800-574-0414

2(1) cont.

	Page 4	
1	MR. FIKSDAL: Thank you. Mr. Newell.	
2	COMMENTS BY DAN NEWELL	
.3	My name is Dan Newell, and I'm the principal	
4	of Blaine High School, and we are at 770 Mitchell Street,	
5	Blaine, Washington 98230. I'm speaking on behalf of	
6	Dr. Marian Barrington, the newly appointed superintendent	
7	of Blaine School District who represents the Blaine School	
8	Board for the purposes of this meeting.	
191	With the addition of a cogen plant at BP	
10	Cherry Point Refinery, it would add a number of additional	
11	benefits to the citizens and the students of the Blaine	
12	School District. Currently the Blaine School District	
13	assessed valuation is approximately 2.2 billion dollars,	
14	and the majority of this high assessment is due to BP and	
15	because of the high assessed value the citizens of the	
16	Blaine School District benefit from a very low levy	
17	assessment. By the addition of the cogen plant the	
18	assessed valuation would increase by approximately 500	3(1)
19	million dollars, bringing our total assessed value some	
20	2.7 billion. Such an increase would result in a taxpayer	
21	of the Blaine School District paying approximately \$1.23	
22	per thousand dollars of assessed valuation. Currently we	
23	pay \$1.73. As you can see with the additional assessed	
24	value our citizens will be saving 50 cents per thousand.	
25	On our current levy this equates to a savings of \$75 per	

Page 5

1	year on a \$150,000 home.
2	Due to these low levy rates the Blaine
3	School District has always been able to pass our levies.
4	Our levy rate in comparison with other districts with
5	rates of upwards of three dollars per thousand enables
6	Blaine the distinct advantage. We not only pass our
7	levies, but we are able to run a levy to the maximum the
8.	state will allow. Not all districts are able to do this
9	because it's cost prohibitive to their taxpayers.
10	Currently the Blaine School District's
11.	operation levy is approximately 21 percent of our current
12	budget. It is with the passage of the levy that the
13	Blaine School District has been able to offer an exemplary
14	program which draws people from across the state and
15	sometimes the nation. This low dollar per thousand levy
16	rate also provides the district great opportunities for
17	the passage of our general obligation bonds. It is with
18	these bonds the district built our schools, your
1.9	children's classrooms, gymnasiums, cafeterias,
20	playgrounds, and this wonderful performing arts center
21	that we are sitting in. The district has recently
22	remodeled and built a number of structures with the 19.6
23	million dollar bond. We have one remaining project to
24	complete, and that's our administrative service center.
2'5	Our estimated completion time will be the summer of 2004.

3(1) cont.

	Page 6
1	Along with the substantial savings to our
2	taxpayers comes a number of jobs, and this would enable a
3	number of people in the Blaine area to have the
4	opportunity to apply for approximately 900 or more
5	available positions. Our students would benefit from this
6	as they complete high school and college enabling them to
7	move onto a wonderful career with BP. Currently our
8.	students are given an in-depth tour of BP during the
9	beginning of each school year. By maintaining a working
10	relationship with this company, our students have been
11	exposed to the industry which has been a constant in our
12	Blaine area and the number of students who do complete
13	college and stay in this area providing more career
14	opportunities and keeping our families together. Thank
15	you very much for your time.
16	MR. FIKSDAL: Thank you. The next three
17	people that are signed up it's either Will or Wy
18	Bannerman.
19	MR. BANNERMAN: Wy Bannerman.
20	MR. FIKSDAL: Fred Schuhmacher and Sam
21.	Crawford.
22	COMMENT OF WYMAN BANNERMAN
23.	My name is Wyman Bannerman, and I live at
24	3455 Kluken Road, which is very near the intersection of
25	the Valley View Road in Grandview. Needless to say I have
I	

Page 7 view property just from the name of the two roads. 1 My concern, and I've voiced this concern at 2 all the meetings so far, is the change in your power When we first talked at the first meeting, there was some chance that they were going to put in a high 5 capacity conductor cable and not change any of the towers, 6 7 just put these cables on the present towers. As I talked to the engineers and BPA and stuff right now that's no 8 longer feasible. It's too expensive or the cables are too heavy or something or other. 10 11 The two options that we have left are the 12 monopole towers or the lattice steel uprights. 13 lattice steel uprights are ugly, and I have a picture of 14 them here. It's the center one right here. Thank you. 15 MR. FIKSDAL: MR. BANNERMAN: As you can see in the center 16 of that fixture -- that picture is taken on the eastern 17 18 part of the Grandview Road where these lines feed the Custer Substation, and they've put in a series of towers. 19 20 That center tower in there is the one that I objected to, and that's one of the two choices left. The other choice 21 22 is the monopole, which is a single pole tower. They have 23 pictures out in the lobby of that. In fact, these 24 pictures are taken at the crest of the hill on my 25 property.

FLYGARE & ASSOCIATES, INC. 1-800-574-0414

4(1)

Page 8 The one problem I have with the pictures is 1 that they blotted out Mount Baker which it sits if you 2 look at the east picture there, Mount Baker should be sitting right there. It's gone for some reason. like to as they talk about studying these different 5 options they mention the remedial action schemes. 6 7 remedial action schemes they've studied what are they going to do with the power if one of the big powers lines 8 falls down, and the temperature is over 85 degrees, and 9 Alcoa is running full-bore, and BP is running full-bore, 10 11 and the power plant is running full-bore, where is power 12 going to go or something. Of course, all of these things 13 can't possibly happen at once, but they have to plan for 14 that. The one thing they left out of their scheme is the fact that there is presently a hundred megawatts of power 15 coming through PSE to feed Arco right now. When they talk 16 about trying to reduce the power from all these concepts 17 18 they forget to mention that those power lines could be 4(3) used to run a hundred megawatts back to somewhere. 19 20 they said they talked about that a little bit, but BPA and PSE evidently don't work together, so I would like some 21 22 more explanation on that I guess. Thank you very much. 23 MR. FIKSDAL: Mr. Schuhmacher. COMMENTS BY FRED SCHUHMACHER 24 25 My name is Fred Schuhmacher. I live at

```
Page 9
       5583, Whitehorn Way --
 1
                     MR. FIKSDAL: Could you speak a little
 2
       closer.
                Thank you.
                     MR. SCHUHMACHER: -- in Blaine.
 5
                     In May of this year I attended a
       presentation by BP and TransCanada Corporation through the
 6
 7
       Whatcom County Council Natural Resource Committee on the
       proposed cogeneration facility at Cherry Point. I came
 8
 9
       away from that meeting with several concerns about the
10
       project as it was presented, and I wrote a letter to EFSEC
       on the following day. I am here to go over again some of
11
12
       the concerns that I expressed in that letter. My main
13
       concern is water cooling for this project. The original
14
       public presentation by BP emphasized the benefits of air
       cooling with its minimum impact on the environment.
15
       change it now to water cooling would impose several
16
       adverse effects on the environment, such as water cooling
17
18
       and the associated cooling towers will require water, and
                                                                       5(1)
       the effluent from the cooling towers will result with an
19
20
       additional burden on the water quality in the outfall area
       of Cherry Point. No cooling tower or effluent would be
21
22
       necessary in air cooling. The cooling towers will create
23
       large quantities of vapor during operation. Cooling water
       is treated to prevent corrosion and algae formation.
24
25
       Traces of dissolved chemicals are in the water vapor and
```

BP Cherry Point Cogeneration Project Final EIS

Page 10 can be carried away by prevailing winds. At present a 2 vapor from the refinery sometimes creates plumes of vapor that at times form a cloud cover over Birch Bay. operation of a 720-megawatt power plant would increase 5(1) this problem by several magnitudes. None of these issues 5 cont. would be there with air cooling. 6 7 I recognize that water cooling will result in some savings to the builder, but this must not take 8 precedence over consideration for the residents of the 9 area and the environment. 10 11 Another comment or point is I just would 12 like to address the purpose of this project. The project 13 is titled BP Cogeneration Project. While I endorse the use of cogeneration for BP, I differ on the main purpose 14 of the project. BP will only use about 12 percent of the 15 power produced, and the other 88 percent will be sold on 16 5(2) the open market by TransCanada, the eventual 17 18 owner/operator of the power plant. For that reason the project should be put forward as the TransCanada or BP 19. 20 power plant project. You cannot call in it any other way. 21 That's all. 22 MR. FIKSDAL: Thank you very much. Council 23 Member Crawford. COMMENTS BY SAM CRAWFORD 24 25 Good evening, Council Members.

FLYGARE & ASSOCIATES, INC. 1-800-574-0414

BP Cherry Point Cogeneration Project Final EIS

Page 11 written a letter regarding the application you're 1 considering to the BP Cherry Point Cogeneration Project, 2 and I would like to read this letter into the record at tonight's open house. I'm Sam Crawford, Whatcom County Council, 5 311 Grand Avenue, Bellingham, Washington, and my home 6 7 address is 1627 Diamond Loop, Bellingham, Washington. I should note that as a member of the 8 9 Whatcom County Council, I speak from my own perspective. 10 The County Council has not formally taken a position on this application. However, I can assure you that I've 11 12 spoken to many of my constituents throughout Whatcom 13 County whom I represent, and I am honored to informally speak for them. 14 As I review the Draft Environmental Impact 15 Statement for this project, which I'm going to put down 16 17 because this is heavy, dated September 5, 2003, I see the Applicant is required to compare the impacts of the 18 19 proposal to the impacts of no action. In most cases the 20 no action impacts are generally described correspondingly 21 as no impact. In light of the proponent's prepared 22 23 materials describing the positive aspects of this project, 6(1) one could view no action, that is no construction of this 24 25. facility, as detrimental actually in a number of ways.

Page 12

1 I'm going to name a few.

There would be no new steam source to be 2 3 provided to the existing facility thus necessitating the continued use of older, less efficient, more polluting Greenhouse gas offsets would not occur in other 5 facilities. Thirty years of proposed greenhouse gas 6 7 mitigation would not occur. Recycling of Alcoa Intalco Works cooling water would not occur. Post use treatment 8 9 of this recycled water with updated treatment before 10 discharge to the Puget Sound would not occur. Wetland 11 enhancements to the CMA 1 and CMA 2 two sites creating low 12 hydraulic resonance time that enhances existing wetlands 13 and restores drained wetlands would not occur. A wetland 14 enhancement ratio of nearly 3.6 to 1. Yes, I did do the math myself. Effecting the enhancement of 110 acres of 15 wetlands would not occur. Wildlife habitat quality 16 improvements associated with wetland enhancement along 17 18 with planting, cultivating, and monitoring of native 19 trees, plants, and grasses would not occur. An aggressive 20 noxious weed control program overseen by the Whatcom 21 County Noxious Weed Control Board would not occur. 22 hundred and thirty five megawatts of needed additional 23 electrical power would not be supplied to the Northwest Power Grid. Further industrial development of land zoned 24 25 and set aside specifically for this type of use under

6(1) cont.

Page 13 Whatcom County zoning rules and the Whatcom County 1 Comprehensive Plan would not occur at this time. 2 opportunity for 30 additional living wage jobs in Whatcom 6(1) County would be lost, and the revenue generation of cont. approximately 6 million dollars in annual property taxes 5 to be paid by this facility would not occur. 6 7 I should mention there is no doubt that the County portion of this revenue is badly needed during this 8 time of budget shortfalls. 9 When one considers these attributes of the 10 11 proposed project, it is an oversimplification to say the 12 no action alternative has no impact on Whatcom County. Much of my time on the County Council is spent working on 13 discussing and implementing planning for the future. 14 planning practice involves a myriad of potential impacts 15 and results in an attempt to envision a future that is 16 vibrant, attractive, and provides the highest qualities of 17 18 life for succeeding generations of Whatcom County Citizens. This proposal does have the potential to fit in 19 20 well to that vision in many perspectives. No action in 21 and of itself would speak volumes about the future of your 22 county. 23 Based on my reading of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I see this project as an 24 6(1) 25 important component of our designated and zoned heavy

Page 14 impact industrial portion of Whatcom County. I urge you 1 to work cooperatively with the Applicant to carefully 2 consider the concerns of the community, along with any negative impacts that may be associated with the project, and permit the construction of this facility in a manner 5 that benefits the people of Whatcom County, as well as the 6 7 Applicant. I appreciate your time and the opportunity 8 9 to comment. Thank you. 10 MR. FIKSDAL: Thank you. The next three people are the last name is 11. 12 Eventoff. 13 MR. EVENTOFF: Right here. 14 MR. FIKSDAL: Okay. You're next. Sandra Abernathy and Wendy Steffensen. 15 16 COMMENT BY FRANK EVENTOFF 17 I am Frank Eventoff, 7086 Atwood Road, Ferndale, and my primary concerns are environmental. I 18 19 hear what everybody is saying. I can't disagree with 20 anything. It sounds good. Like what the gentleman said about air cooling, I don't know much about it, but it 21 22 sounds like it makes some sense. I guess I have questions 23 like is bigger better? And maybe balance should be considered over growth. Do we need more electricity that 24 would be generated by fossil fuels? We're hearing 25

FLYGARE & ASSOCIATES, INC. 1-800-574-0414

6(2) cont.

	Page 15
1	distorts of this planet and maybe alternative energy would
2	be, renewable energy would be a wiser investment. I'm
3	just looking at the energy scams that have happened and
4	where Californía is now in this whole regional thing and
5	all; that there's so much that we don't know about what's
6	going on behind the scenes, and so we really do we
7	really know where our energy requirements stand today and
8.	do we need more energy? I don't know that. Maybe you do.
9	I don't. But it would sure be nice to address that
10	question before we go using more fossil fuels anyway.
11	I'm just also concerned that I've been
12	following Sumas 2 a bit and the Fraser Air Valley, Fraser
13	Air Valley Basin, and I'm wondering is this going to
14	impact the air quality and the buildup of pollutants in
15	that air basin? So I guess that's about it. It might
16	serve the government well to educate us, the populous,
17	about being more energy efficient, more emphasis on
18	efficient products than more power. Thank you.
19	MR. FIKSDAL: Thank you. Ms. Abernathy.
20	COMMENTS BY SANDRA ABERNATHY
21	I actually signed up on the wrong sheet, so
22	I'm going to say a little bit anyway. I haven't
23	dramatically read the report. So my name is Sandra
24	Abernathy and I live at 6905 Holeman Avenue, which is at
2.5	Point Whitehorn, so it's nearby, and I also have other

7(1)

	Page 16	
	1 family members that live near the plant.	1
	2 My concern I would agree with	2
	3 Mr. Schuhmacher that I am concerned about the air quality,	3
	4 especially being downwind. I don't live downwind, but I	4
	5 have other family members that live directly downwind.	5
8(1)	And obviously the point that I'm trying to make right now	6
	7 is that there is a lot of smell from the BP plant now, and	7
	8 I'm concerned that there would be additional smell and	8
	9 additional pollution with the prevailing southerly winds	9.
	in that area, but I haven't read it.	10
	MR. FIKSDAL: Well, thank you.	11
	Ms. Steffensen.	12
	COMMENTS BY WENDY STEFFENSEN	13
	My name is Wendy Steffensen. I'm the North	14
	Sound Bay Keeper. I work at Resources. The address there	15
	is 1155 North State Street, Suite 623, Bellingham, 98225.	16
	I was interested to hear what Councilman	17
	Crawford had to say because I haven't read all of the	18
	documents, but I skimmed it pretty thoroughly, and I	19
	didn't come away with the same rosey picture of the	20
	environment that he did.	21
	So one of my concerns is that in terms of	22
0/4\	the fresh water system, the wetlands, Terrell Creek, and	23:
9(1)	Lake Terrell, I didn't really see a cumulative assessment	24
	of what's going on with that system. I see that we're	25

	Page 17	
ı	going to be draining and filling some wetlands. We have	1
	2 stormwater impacts. We're going to have air pollution	2
	3 that's going to settle on this system, as well as	3
9(1)	4 potential, a great potential for acid rain. And although	4
cont.	5 acid rain was mentioned here and stormwater was mentioned,	5
	the system, a cumulative look at the system wasn't taken	6
	7 in terms of flora and fauna and the hydrologic	7
	8 connectivity of the area, so that is one concern I have.	8
	9 And then another thing I noted in terms of	9
	0 the wetlands in the Draft EIS they mentioned that the	10
	wetlands were not significant or not high quality	11
9(2)	wetlands, but yet when you go back to the appendix	12
	3 Washington Fish and Wildlife calls those same areas high	13
	4 priority habitat, so I think there's some disconnect	14
	5 there.	15
	I also noted that like many of these	16
	7 documents we disconnect what happens in the air versus	17
	8 what happens in the water. It's like we believe that what	18
0(0)	goes up in the air doesn't affect the water; that there's	19
9(3)	not cross media contamination. So I would really like to	20
	see an analysis of how is that air pollution affecting	21.
	water; what portion of air pollution is becoming water	22
	3 pollution.	23
9(4)	I guess there was in terms of discharge,	24
	5 water and air discharge, we are looking at better	25
		l .

			8
		Page 18	_
1	٠	technology now, but I also noted we are discharging heavy	
2		metals. And a lot of these heavy metals are persistent	
3		biocumulative toxins, so, again, I have great deal of	9(4)
4		concern about this. Ecology is trying to phase out the	cont.
5		discharge of persistent biocumulative toxins and yet this	
6		wasn't adequately addressed in the report.	
7		I also looked at the need analysis. In	
8		general terms we talked about the regional needs, but	
191		there was no mention of how is this going to fit with SE2	J _{0/5\}
10		and GFX, those proposed projects that may be coming on	9(5)
11		line, and so I was wondering why there was no mention of	
12		those.	
13		And in addition we have a herring reserve	
14		very close by, and there was no mention of the herring	
15		reserve, and I'm wondering what potential disturbance	9(6)
16		there could occur to that herring reserve. Thank you.	
17		MR. FIKSDAL: Thank you very much.	
18		I don't have anymore oh, there is some	
19		more. Sorry.	
20		Thank you. Alan Van Hook has signed up to	
21		speak.	
22		COMMENTS BY ALAN VAN HOOK	
23		I have a very short comment. I'm Alan Van	
24		Hook. My address is Box 549, Blaine, Washington. And I'm	
25		a very small competitor for this project because I	
			CA.

Page 19 generate electricity, and I just went through a very 1 frustrating process with Puget Power, so I understand something about the frustration and the difficulties. I agree with the fellow who said that the purpose of the plant is probably primarily not 5 cogeneration, but obviously it's somewhat. 6 7 question that probably I can address if I'm able to get Chapter 2, which I don't believe was included in the 8 handouts tonight but is apparently available, and that was 9 1.0 alluded to by one of the folks who talked about the air 11 pollution products in that I know from long ago that it 12 was well recognized that there's negative synergy between 10(1) 13 the release of heavy metals and the petroleum products 14 vapors release. So that may have already been done, and I don't know. But I would be real interested to see a 15 cumulative analysis, which may have been done, between the 16 improvements that have been mentioned by Representative 17 Crawford and others and the net effect in terms of the 18 balance of heavy metals and petroleum products that are 19 20 bound to be in the air, so obviously there's better technologies available now than were in place when the 21 22 original refinery was put in. 23 And I'm not personally privy to what's going to happen with the Intalco Aluminum Smelter process, so, 24 10(2) 25 you know, whether that's a cumulative effect. You know,

Page 20 if it's been evaluated both ways, with and without Intalco 1 10(2) cont. 2 operating as a smelter, etc. 3 And I will say and my recent research tells me that we are going to be needing additional energy in this area by the year 2012 to 2013. The question is 5 probably not whether we're going to generate but where is 6 7 it going to come from. So one of the alternatives I see that Puget Power is planning on coming up with some of the 8 power from coal-fired plants which I think is very 9 10 interesting in light of the siting process that would be going on with that. So I would like to see in the 11 12 alternatives, if it hasn't been done, some kind of 13 analysis of, you know, what are the air pollution, water 14 pollution scenarios versus burning this finite resource 10(3) natural gas versus burning coal or other alternatives 15 because we're not going to get it all from wind power 16 17 because we have to have capacity that's, you know, available on a day-by-day basis. 18 19 So anyway I'm just commenting mostly whether 20 some of these items may have been addressed in which case I just haven't seen it, and that's probably my fault, so I 21 was just curious whether they have been addressed. Thank 22 23 you. MR. FIKSDAL: Thank you. That is the end of 24 25 the list of people that's signed up. Is there anybody

	Page 21	
	1 that wishes to give a comment that didn't sign up?	1
	Back there. I might add while come on up	2
	3 that if you want a copy of the EIS just ask us, and	3
	4 we'll get you a copy. Give us your and name address. If	4
	5 you don't want the big paper copy to lug around, it's	5
	6 available on our website which I think is probably on one	6
	of the sheets that you got. It's www.efsec.wa.gov, and	7
	8 that is all on that too.	.8
	9 Give us your name.	9
	10 COMMENTS BY KATHY CLEVELAND	10
	Hi, I'm Kathy Cleveland. I live at 4961	11.
	Morgan Drive. I'm not really prepared to speak, but I	12
	have to speak anyways. I agree with what Wendy said, and	13
	14 I wish there was more people that had an understanding of	14
	the environment that could read this because I think a lot	15
	of things are not adequately or wholly addressed. There	16
	are things that would like to be swept under the carpet;	17
	that basically by the time it comes to a public hearing	18
	this is already a done deal, so we just kind of mitigate	19
	20 things to help us out.	20:
	One of the things that I think is not	21
	adequately addressed is the issue on particulates. I	22
11(1	would like a much further study done on that. There is	23
	somebody that might have time to do it that works with	24
	25 Huxley College at Western that now works with the	25
		i .

Page 22 Swinomish Indians down by Lummi Bay that directly studied 1 particulates going into the water and what happens and what's the long-term effect of that, saving the particulates in the air. Also at one of our first meetings here up in 5 6 the Blaine Library about a year ago citizens addressed 7 some issues that they would like to see the mitigation on, and one of those issues was sound. And I was at a public 8 -- the refinery had an open house about a month ago and 10 another citizen brought up the fact and asked, "Did you 11 put a sound monitor in the area of Cottonwood?" And they 12 said, "No." They still had not done it. It may have been done recently, but it doesn't do any good to do testing or 13 14 bogus testing, and say, "Oh, look. We've had this out 15 here in this area." Like Birch Bay Villa is on the hill 16 where they don't get any noise. So if you do your testing 17 where your results are known and the results are going to 18 come out in your favor, that is not accurate and fair testing or modeling of what's really going to be going on. 19 20 I haven't had time -- I'll speak with Michael Lufkin afterwards about what has and has not been 21. done. I have a list buried somewhere of all of the things 22 23 that citizens wanted mitigated. I guess I'll have to 24 follow up on each and every one. 25 Thank you for your time.

FLYGARE & ASSOCIATES, INC. 1-800-574-0414

11(1) cont.

11(2)

Page 23 MR. FIKSDAL: Thank you. Is there anybody 1 else that would like to give a comment on the Draft 2 Environmental Impact Statement? I see no hands raised. I guess there are 5 none, so that will conclude our comments for tonight and conclude this meeting. I want to thank you very much for 6 7 coming. It's very important for the Council and for the Applicant and everybody to hear your comments. Your 8 comments will be addressed in the Final Environmental 9 Impact Statement that the Council and Bonneville will 10 prepare. I also want to remind everybody that the Council 11 12 will have another opportunity for public comment during 13 their adjudicative hearing process, and it's scheduled now 14 for December. There will be a time that you can address the Council again. If you aren't on our mailing list and 15 want to be on the mailing list to receive notices of those 16 17 hearings, sign up with Mariah out at the table as you leave or you can go to our website and email. Our email 18 19 address is efsec. -- anyway it's on your list somewhere. 20 Again, thank you very much. Again, the close of comment is November 3, 2003. With that, thank you again. Good 21 22 night. 23 (Public meeting was adjourned at 7:51 p.m.) 24 25

			Page 24
1		INDEX	
2	PUBLIC COMMENTS		PAGE
3	Mark Lawrence		1
4	Rob Pochert		2
5	Dan Newell		4
6	Wyman Bannerman		6
7	Fred Schuhmacher		8
8	Sam Crawford		10
9	Frank Eventoff		14
10	Sandra Abernathy		15
11	Wendy Steffensen		16
12	Alan Van Hook		18
13	Kathy Cleveland		21
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

	Page 25
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	AFFIDAVIT
6	
7	I, Shaun Linse, CCR, Certified Court Reporter,
8	do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript
9	prepared under my direction is a true and accurate
10	record of the proceedings taken on October 1, 2003,
11	in Blaine, Washington.
12	
13	
14	
15	Shaun Linse, CCR
16	CCR NO. LI-NS-ES-M4020H
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	